



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/917,070

07/26/2001

Najeeb Abdulrahiman

035451-0140 (3669.Palm)

6244

49637 7590 10/09/2007
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.
9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD
SUITE 810
LOS ANGELES, CA 90069

EXAMINER

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

80

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/917,070		ABDULRAHIMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Nghi V. Tran		2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, 74-89 and 91-96 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3, 5-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, 74-89, and 91-96 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on July 02, 2007. Claims 1, 6, 27, 40, 50, 67, 75, 86, and 92 have been amended. Claims 2, 4, 24, 37, 47, 55, 72, 73, and 90 have been canceled. Therefore, claims 1, 3, 5-23, 25-36, 38-46, 48-54, 56-71, 74-89, and 91-96 are presented for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5-19, 23, 25-27, 29-30, 32-33, 35, 38-39, 41-44, 46, 48-51, 53, 56-59, 67-69, 71, 74-75, 78-80, 86, 88-89, 91-92, and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0124020, in view of Nelson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,498,897 (hereinafter Nelson), and further in view Adachi, United States Patent Number 6,877,037 (hereinafter Adachi).

4. With respect to claims 1, 23, 35, 46, 53, 67, and 86, Janakiraman teaches a method of transferring electronic data [see abstract] from a remote location [110 i.e.

web server] to an electronic device [120 i.e. client] over a bandwidth-constrained connection [paragraph 0009 i.e. wireless devices such as cell phones], the method comprising:

- selecting electronic data using an electronic device [paragraph 0029 i.e. a user is capable of inputting to client device];
- determining whether the electronic data has a supported format [paragraphs 0015-0016 and item 121 in fig.1 i.e. multimedia analyzer]; and
- automatically issuing a transfer instruction for the electronic data based on acceptability criteria, the acceptability criteria comprising whether the electronic data has a supported format [paragraph 0031-0032].

However, Janakiraman is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server.

In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses sending a list of supported formats [col.4, lns.23-26 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig.5] [figs.2-4].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, lns.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of

Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, Ins.24-25].

Neither Janakiraman or Nelson discloses automatically updating the list of supported formats. Further, Nelson teaches the list of supported format.

In wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating the list of supported formats to reflect the changes in applications included in the electronic device [see abstract and fig.5].

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, Ins.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

5. With respect to claims 3, 25, 38, 48, and 56, Janakiraman is silent on the list of supported formats is sent to the proxy server upon selecting the electronic data.

In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses the list of supported formats is sent to the proxy server upon selecting the electronic data [col.2, 46-52 and figs.2-4].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server upon selecting the electronic data because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, lns.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, lns.24-25].

6. With respect to claims 7, 57, 78, 80, and 94, Janakiraman further teaches selecting electronic data comprises sending a request to view an Internet web page [122 i.e. web browser].

7. With respect to claims 8, 32, 43, 79, and 93, Janakiraman further teaches sending a request to view an Internet web page comprises entering an Internet web page address in an Internet web browser [122 i.e. web browser].

8. With respect to claim 9, Janakiraman further teaches sending a request to view an Internet web page comprises activating a hyperlink [122 i.e. web browser].

9. With respect to claim 10, Janakiraman further teaches selecting electronic data comprises sending a request to transfer an electronic file [paragraphs 0029-0030].

10. With respect to claim 11, Janakiraman further teaches sending a request to transfer an electronic file comprises issuing a request to download the electronic file from a remote source location [paragraphs 0029-0030].

11. With respect to claims 12, 30, 42, 51, 59, 68-69, 71, and 88, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic device is selected from a handheld computer, a pager, and a mobile phone [paragraph 0009 i.e. wireless devices such as cell phones].

12. With respect to claim 13, Janakiraman further teaches determining whether the electronic data has a supported format comprises examining the electronic data to determine its format [fig.3 and paragraph 0028 i.e. multimedia analyzer].

13. With respect to claims 14, 29, 41 and 89, Janakiraman further teaches determining whether the electronic data has a supported format comprises comparing the selected data format to a list of supported formats [fig.3 and paragraphs 0031-0037].

14. With respect to claim 15, Janakiraman further teaches the determining whether the electronic data has a supported format [fig.3 and paragraphs 0031-0037].

However, Janakiraman is silent on issuing a transfer instruction steps are performed by a proxy server.

In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses issuing a transfer instruction steps are performed by a proxy server [figs.2-5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, lns.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, lns.24-25].

15. With respect to claims 16 and 58, Janakiraman further teaches the transfer instruction comprises an instruction to transfer the electronic data to the electronic device [paragraphs 0029-0030].

16. With respect to claim 17, Janakiraman further teaches a transfer instruction comprises an instruction to transfer the electronic data over a wireless connection [paragraph 0009 i.e. a wireless connection is inherent because web browsers may be found on wireless devices].

17. With respect to claim 18, Janakiraman further teaches transferring the selected electronic data in response to the transfer instruction [paragraph 0031-0032 and fig.3].

18. With respect to claim 19, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic data is selected from the group consisting of electronic audio, video, graphic, applet, program, and Internet web page plug-in files [paragraph 0031].

19. With respect to claims 33 and 44, Janakiraman further teaches the source location is selected from the group consisting of a computer, an electronic file server, and another electronic device [110 i.e. web server].

20. With respect to claims 5, 26, 39, 49, 74, and 91, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on automatically updating the list of supported formats after a file compatibility error occurs in the electronic device.

In wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating the list of supported formats after a file compatibility error occurs in the electronic device [see abstract, figs.3&5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, lns.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been

motivated in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

21. With respect to claims 6, 27, 40, 50, 75, and 92, Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on manually updating the list of supported formats.

In wireless communication method, Adachi discloses manually updating the list of supported formats [see abstract and col.1, Ins.44-64 i.e. manually updating is interpreted as a user-triggered event occurs on the user's terminal].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by manually updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, Ins.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

22. Claims 20-22, 34, 45, 52, 60, 76-77, and 95-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakirama, Nelson, and Adachi as applied to claims 1, 23, 35, 46, 53, 67, and 86 above, and further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 (hereinafter Schwartz).

23. With respect to claim 20, both Janakiraman and Nelson are silent on sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server [figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pre-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson, and Adachi, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

24. With respect to claims 21 and 76, Janakiraman is silent on the acceptability criteria further comprises whether the electronic data has an acceptable source location.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server [figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. an acceptable source location is interpreted as a pre-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson, and Adachi, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server

because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

25. With respect to claims 22, 34, 45, 52, 60, and 77, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic data has a supported format and the transfer instruction.

However, Janakiraman, Nelson, and Adachi are silent on an unacceptable source location and the transfer instruction comprises an instruction not to send the electronic data to the electronic device.

In a wireless communication method, Schwartz discloses an unacceptable source location and the transfer instruction comprises an instruction not to send the electronic data to the electronic device [figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pre-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson, and Adachi, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

26. With respect to claim 95, Janakiraman, Nelson, and Adachi are silent on means for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude electronic data originating from an unacceptable source.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches means [i.e. proxy server] for filtering the requested electronic data to exclude electronic data originating from an unacceptable source [figs.4-7; col.8, lns.12-67; and col.14, lns.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pres-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson, Adachi, and further in view of Schwartz by sending a list of unacceptable source locations to a proxy server because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

27. With respect to claim 96, Janakiraman further teaches the electronic data is selected from the group consisting of electronic audio, video, graphic, applet, program, and Internet web page plug-in files [paragraph 0031].

28. Claims 28, 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman, Nelson, and Adachi as applied to claims 23, 53, and 86 above, and further in view of Timothy et al., "Web Page Filtering and Re-Authoring for Mobile Users," (hereinafter Timothy).

29. With respect to claim 28, Janakiraman is silent on the information transmission system comprises a proxy server configured to determine whether the requested electronic information has a supported format.

In a wireless communication method, Timothy discloses the information transmission system comprises a proxy server configured to determine whether the requested electronic information has a supported format [pages 534-535].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson and Adachi, and further in view of Timothy by configured the information transmission via a proxy server because this feature can be providing the transformation services without loss of information. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to conserve wireless bandwidth and device memory.

30. With respect to claims 31, 36, 54, 70, and 87, Janakiraman teaches the information transmission system comprises a wireless network.

However, Janakiraman is silent on information transmission system comprises a proxy server.

In a wireless communication method, Timothy discloses information transmission system comprises a proxy server [pages 534-535].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman, Nelson and Adachi, and further in view of Timothy by configured the information transmission via a proxy server because this feature can be providing the transformation services without loss of information. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to conserve wireless bandwidth and device memory.

31. Claims 61-62, 64-65 and 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janakiraman, in view of Castell et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0132607 (hereinafter Castell).

32. With respect to claims 61 and 81, Janakiraman teaches a method of receiving information embedded in an Internet web page, the method comprising:

- issuing a request from a portable electronic device to a server [fig.1], the request comprising a command to transmit electronic information included in an Internet web page originating from a remote location [paragraphs 0027-0028]; and

- wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the portable electronic device only if the information is compatible with the loaded plug-ins [fig.2 and paragraph 0029].
- transmitting a list of plug-ins loaded on the portable electronic device to the server; and comparing within the server the electronic information to the list of plug-ins to determine if the electronic information is compatible with the loaded plug-ins [paragraphs 0031-0037].

However, Janakiraman does not explicitly show the proxy server.

In a wireless communication system, Castell suggests or discloses the proxy server [i.e. wireless gateway, fig.1].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Castell by implementing its on the proxy server because this feature will prevent excessive congestion of the wireless network [paragraph 0053]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to stop a flood of unsolicited contentious message to the wireless users [paragraph 0054].

33. With respect to claim 62, Janakiraman further teaches the list of plug-ins includes all operational plug-ins included in the portable electronic device at the time of the request [paragraph 0029].

34. With respect to claims 64 and 82, Janakiraman further teaches the portable electronic device is selected from the group consisting of a laptop computer, a handheld computer, a pager, and a mobile phone [paragraph 0009 i.e. cell phones].

35. With respect to claim 65, Janakiraman further teaches the remote location is selected from the group consisting of a server computer and another portable electronic device [110 i.e. Web server].

36. Claims 63 and 83-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Janakiraman and Castell as applied to claims 61 and 81, and further in view of Adachi, U.S. Patent No. 6,877,037.

37. With respect to claim 63 and 83-84, both Janakiraman and Castell are silent on automatically updated automatically to reflect changes in the portable electronic device prior to transmitting to the proxy server.

In a wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating to reflect changes in the portable electronic device prior to transmitting to the proxy server [see abstract and figs.3&5].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Timothy, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list to reflect changes in the portable electronic device prior to transmitting to the proxy server because this feature allows

Art Unit: 2151

efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, Ins.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Timothy, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

38. Claims 66 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over both Janakiraman and Castell as applied to claims 61 and 81 above, and further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 (hereinafter Schwartz).

39. With respect to claims 66 and 85, Janakiraman further teaches generating a list of unacceptable remote locations and wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the electronic device only if the web page does not originate from an unacceptable remote location.

In wireless communication, Schwartz teaches generating a list of unacceptable remote locations and wirelessly transmitting the electronic information to the electronic device only if the web page does not originate from an unacceptable remote location [figs.4-7; col.8, Ins.12-67; and col.14, Ins.10-67 i.e. a list of unacceptable source locations is broadly interpreted as a list is not in a pres-chosen item menu].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in

view of Schwartz by generating a list of unacceptable remote locations because this feature creates custom channels or filter unwanted source location to save resources such as bandwidth, cache, power, and etc. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Schwartz in order to filter unwanted source location without burden on a thin device.

Response to Arguments

40. Applicant's arguments filed January 18, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following: Janakiraman teaches a method of transferring electronic data [see abstract] from a remote location [110 i.e. web server] to an electronic device [120 i.e. client] over a bandwidth-constrained connection [paragraph 0009 i.e. wireless devices such as cell phones], the method comprising: selecting electronic data using an electronic device [paragraph 0029 i.e. a user is capable of inputting to client device]; determining whether the electronic data has a supported format [paragraphs 0015-0016 and item 121 in fig.1 i.e. multimedia analyzer]; and automatically issuing a transfer instruction for the electronic data based on acceptability criteria, the acceptability criteria comprising whether the electronic data has a supported format [paragraph 0031-0032]. However, Janakiraman is silent on sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server. In wireless communication method, Nelson discloses sending a list of supported formats [col.4, lns.23-26 i.e. MPEG-1, MPEG-2, MPEG-4, H.263, RealVideo, and other packetized forms of digital

media] to a proxy server [item 44 of fig.5] [figs.2-4]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, lns.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, lns.24-25]. Either Janakiraman or Nelson discloses on automatically updating the list of supported formats. Further, Nelson teaches the list of supported format. In wireless communication method, Adachi discloses automatically updating the list of supported formats to reflect the changes in applications included in the electronic device [see abstract and fig.5]. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, lns.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, lns.65-67].

41. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F. 2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F. 2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Applicant obviously attacks references individually without taking into consideration based on the teaching of combinations of references as show in the above.

42. In response to applicant's argument that the claimed combination cannot change the principle of operation of the primary reference or render the reference inoperable for its intended purpose, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson by sending a list of supported formats to a proxy server because this feature enables to select the appropriate format and applications for playback based upon the specific characteristics [Nelson, col.2, Ins.46-52]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Janakiraman in view of Nelson in order to properly initialize the decoder for the media format [Nelson, col.1, Ins.24-25].

43. In response to applicant's argument that obviousness would be an illogical and inappropriate process, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi by automatically updating the list of supported formats because this feature allows efficient updating of a number of data modules by sending only one location registration request to the network [Adachi, col.8, Ins.52-57]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify both Janakiraman and Nelson, and further in view of Adachi in order to receive the copy of the most recent data and the version number from the server system and updates the installed [Adachi, col.1, Ins.65-67].

Conclusion

44. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

45. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100